

REMARKS

Claims 1-13, all the claims pending in the application, are rejected. Claims 1, 3, 8, 9 and 13 are amended. New claims 14-17 are added. Claims 2 and 4-7 are cancelled.

Support for the Amendments

The amendments to claims 1 and 13 are supported at least by the description on page 6, lines 5-11 and the illustrations in Figs. 1 and 2.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. This rejection is traversed for at least the following reasons.

Amended Claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended to define the invention, with reference to the description on page 6 lines 5 — 11 and the illustration in Figs. 1 and 2 solely for explanation but without limitation to the illustrated embodiment, as being a seat unit having a back shell 10, a seat base 22, a seat back 26 and side frame members 12, 14 that are coupled to the back shell 10 and provide a support for the seat base 22 and the seat back 26, the back rest being mounted to pivot 30 at a point proximate a junction with the seat base 22 and being foldable at the pivot 30 between an upright seat position and a fold-forward bed position on top of the seat base. Disposed in the back shell is a contoured structure 32 having a recess 34 for a passenger head in a first portion and an adjacent support portion 36, 38 for supporting the seat back in the upright position.

Amended Claim 13

Claim 13 has been amended in a manner similar to claim 1, and defines the use of plural seat units that are arranged ‘in line’ along the longitudinal axis of an aircraft.

Distinction over the Prior Art

The Examiner has identified several prior art references as having possible relevance to the invention as originally claimed. Applicants would submit that the claims, as now amended, are clearly patentable over the cited art.

Bettell

The Examiner refers to fig. 5 of Bettell (20090146005) as being relevant. However, Bettel has an effective prior art date that is after the effective filing date of the present application, based upon the PCT filing on February 17, 2005.

Quan et al

The Examiner refers to Figs 6, 7 and 8 of Quan et al as being relevant. However, those figures do not teach or suggest a seat back that folds forward to form a bed surface, as now claimed. The only structure that folds forward in the illustration is a portion 90 of the seat back 92 in order to form a booster seat 96 for a child.

Beroth et al

The Examiner refers to Fig. 9 of Beroth et al as being relevant. However, that figure does not teach or suggest a seat back that folds forward to form a bed surface, as now claimed.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Alan J. Kasper/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: March 26, 2010

Alan J. Kasper
Registration No. 25,426